

United States Patent and Trademark Office

<u> 91</u>

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia , 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/092,091	03/06/2002	Jerome Swartz	. 021XG	1517
7	590 05/13/2003		•	
Kirschstein, Ottinger, Israel & Schiffmiller, P.C. 489 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10017-6105			EXAMINER	
			· KIM, AHSHIK	
New Tolk, IN I	10017-0103		<u> </u>	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	1		2876	
			DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003	•

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

→ ¥		<i>*</i>	
	Applicati n No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/092,091	SWARTZ, JEROME	
, laviony housen	Examin r	Art Unit	
	Ahshik Kim	2876	
The MAILING DATE of this communicat	ion appears on the c ver sheet	with the c rrespondence address	
THE REPLY FILED 20 March 2003 FAILS TO Pl Therefore, further action by the applicant is require final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be e condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	red to avoid abandonment of th ither: (1) a timely filed amendm f Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3	is application. A proper reply to a nent which places the application in	
PERIOD	FOR REPLY [check either a) o	r b)]	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the m			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing dath no event, however, will the statutory period for rep ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST RE 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.13/ree have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received be timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment.	oly expire later than SIX MONTHS from PLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MON 6(a). The date on which the petition under period of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory period by the Office later than three months at	n the mailing date of the final rejection. THS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP Inder 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extens Conding amount of the fee. The appropriate extens and for reply originally set in the final Office action;	sion Ision
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Ap 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be en	itered because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would requi	ire further consideration and/or	search (see NOTE below);	
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see		,	
(c) they are not deemed to place the appliance issues for appeal; and/or	ication in better form for appea	by materially reducing or simplifying the	ne
(d) they present additional claims withoutNOTE:	canceling a corresponding nur	mber of finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following	ng rejection(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	_ would be allowable if submitte	ed in a separate, timely filed amendmer	nt
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ req application in condition for allowance beca		een considered but does NOT place the	:
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be conside raised by the Examiner in the final rejection		SOLELY to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed ame explanation of how the new or amended cl			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as f	follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: None.			
Claim(s) rejected: 30-39.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on _	is a) approved or b)	disapproved by the Examiner.	÷
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure S	Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)	
10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>		MICHAEL G. LEE SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800	



17

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: It is the Examiner's view that the Applicant's position argued in response is taught by Humble et al. (US 4,676,343) in view of Sherman et al. (US 5,347,115). Shreman patent was relied on to cure the deficiency of Humble, which is a label to be adhered/attached to the product. Human readable information is already disclosed in the prmary reference to Humble.

Continuation of 10. Other: Claims 30-39 remain rejected as set forth in Final Office Action (See paper #6).